DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 742 RC 021 864

AUTHOR Garza, Hisauro
TITLE Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America. JSRI Occasional Paper No. 58, Latino Studies Series.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Julian Samora Research Inst.
PUB DATE 1999-03-00
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM Web site: http://www.jsri.msu.edu/RandS/research/ops
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advocacy; College Environment; *College Faculty; Ethnic Bias; Ethnic Studies; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; *Hispanic Americans; Prestige; *Professional Recognition; Researchers; *Scholarship
IDENTIFIERS *Chicano Studies; Chicanos; Latinos; *Objectivity

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes biases in academe concerning what constitutes "legitimate" and "rigorous" scholarship and examines how these biases interact with decision-making power to place minority scholars and their research into a traditionally ascriptive secondary role. Looking specifically at the Chicano/Latino scholar, it is argued that the racial/ethnic factor seems to interact with another pervasive source of division among scholars: the tension between doing research for research's sake and the more applied aspect of academics. This brings into play larger questions about political commitment, partisanship, and advocacy, as well as the relative merits of researcher objectivity and "scientific detachment" versus the empathic understanding of the participant observer. Data from the Carnegie National Faculty Survey (1984) and the National Latino Faculty Survey (1987) are used to compare the views of Latino and non-Hispanic faculty on scholarship and university life and to present the perceptions of Chicano and Puerto Rican faculty on how Latino group-based research is rated in academe. The concluding section discusses the paucity and limitations of existing research on Chicano faculty and the ethnic/racial cleavages in academe. Contains 28 references. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 742

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Occasional Paper No. 58

Latino Studies Series

Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America

by Hisauro Garza

Sierra Research and Technical Services

Occasional Paper No. 58

March 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Jorge Chapa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Julian Samora Research Institute

Michigan State University • 112 Paolucci Building
East Lansing, MI 48824-1110
Phone (517) 432-1317 • Fax (517) 432-2221
Home Page: www.jsri.msu.edu

SAMORA RESEARCH INSTITUTE JULIAN

RC 021864

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America

by Hisauro Garza
Sierra Research and Technical Services

Occasional Paper No. 58
March 1999

About the Author: Dr. Hisauro Garza

Dr. Garza is president of Sierra Research and Technical Services in Fresno, Calif. He was previously a professor in the Chicano and Latin American Studies Department at the California State University, Fresno. He received his BAwith highest honors in sociology from UC Santa Cruz, and his MA and Ph.D. from the UC Berkeley.

He has been a consultant with state and national institutions and research efforts, including the State of California, the American Educational Research Association, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), and the U.S. Department of Justice. He was one of the founders of the National Association for Chicano Studies and, in 1987, Dr. Garza conducted the first national survey of its kind on Chicano/Latino professors and their scholarship.

RC 021864

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Julian Samora Research Institute
Dr. Jorge Chapa, Interim Director
Danny Layne, Layout Editor

SUGGESTED CITATION

Garza, Hisauro "Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America," *JSRI Occasional Paper #58*, The Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1999.

The **Julian Samora Research Institute** is committed to the generation, transmission, and application of knowledge to serve the needs of Latino communities in the Midwest. To this end, it has organized a number of publication initiatives to facilitate the timely dissemination of current research and information relevant to Latinos.

- *Research Reports:* **JSRI**'s flagship publications for scholars who want a quality publication with more detail than usually allowed in mainstream journals. These are edited and reviewed in-house. Research Reports are selected for their significant contribution to the knowledge base of Latinos.

- *Working Papers:* for scholars who want to share their preliminary findings and obtain feedback from others in Latino studies. Some editing provided by **JSRI**.

- *Statistical Briefs/CIFRAS:* for the Institute's dissemination of "facts and figures" on Latino issues and conditions. Also designed to address policy questions and to highlight important topics.

- *Occasional Papers:* for the dissemination of speeches and papers of value to the Latino community which are not necessarily based on a research project. Examples include historical accounts of people or events, "oral histories," motivational talks, poetry, speeches, and related presentations.

Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America

Table of Contents

Introduction *1*

Chicano Scholarship *1*

Political Commitment, Partnership and "Objective" Scholarship *2*

Latino Professors' Views on Scholarship and University Life *6*

Scholarship *6*

Research *7*

Conclusion *9*

The Julian Samora Research Institute is the Midwest's premier policy research and outreach center to the Hispanic community. The Institute's mission includes:

- *Generation of a program of research and evaluation to examine the social, economic, educational, and political condition of Latino communities.*
- *Transmission of research findings to academic institutions, government officials, community leaders, and private sector executives through publications, public policy seminars, workshops, and consultations.*
- *Provision of technical expertise and support to Latino communities in an effort to develop policy responses to local problems.*
- *Development of Latino faculty, including support for the development of curriculum and scholarship for Chicano/Latino Studies.*

Objectivity, Scholarship, and Advocacy: The Chicano/Latino Scholar in America

Introduction

In this paper, I analyze the biases in academe concerning what is and is not "legitimate" and "rigorous" scholarship. I look at how these biases interact with decision-making power in such a way as to place relative newcomers to the scholarly scene and their research into a traditionally ascriptive secondary role. I analyze the social status of one of these newcomer groups to academe: the so-called "minority" scholar.

More specifically, I look at the case of the Chicano/Latino scholar. I argue that the racial/ethnic factor seems to interact with another pervasive source of division among scholars. This is the tension in academe between "doing research" for research's sake and the more applied aspect of academics. This brings into play larger questions about political commitment, partisanship, and advocacy, as well as the tensions between objectivity and the presumed attendant "social detachment" and subjectivity and the equally presumed lack of this social distance. These interrelated issues are areas which not only merit study, but which have been grossly neglected; a fact not all that unrelated to the racism, biases, and distribution of power in academic decision-making in general, nor to the differential social ascriptions in academe based on these.

Race and ethnicity operate as the basis for social placement in equal employment opportunity generally (Braddock and McPartland, 1986; Burstein, 1985; Alvarez et al., 1979), as well as in academe specifically, and as the criteria for placement in the lower segments or strata across and within academic departments (Rochín and de la Torre, 1986; Wingfield, 1982; Piliawsky, 1982; Myers, 1977; Rafky, 1972). Thus, racism often seems to raise the possibility of racial/ethnic minorities becoming suspect as scholars.

Chicano Scholarship

A "scholar" is generally someone who, after mastering an academic discipline, pursues knowledge and understanding through the systematic or scientific acquisition of information and critical analysis of relevant facts. Typically, this endeavor takes place within an academic or university setting. This person typically has a faculty appointment ordinarily in a four-year research university where original research is carried out. A scholar is an intellectual who happens to be within an academic institutional setting. In this sense, all scholars are intellectuals, whereas all intellectuals may not necessarily be scholars.

The term "Chicano scholarship" has generally been used and interpreted in at least two ways: 1) as scholarship (any scholarship) practiced by Chicanos, and 2) as a specific type of scholarship practiced by Chicanos. Similarly, the term "Chicano scholar" also has these dual potential meanings: 1) a Chicano academic practicing the art or science of scholarship in general, or 2) a Chicano academic who practices this specific type of scholarship which deals generally with something called "the Chicano experience." This confusion or duality in meaning probably surfaced because of the term Chicano itself. This term also has two separate yet interrelated meanings. On the one hand, it is a social, demographic label similar to Italian, German, etc., used to refer to those American citizens who trace their roots to Mexico (e.g., also Mexican American). On the other, it is a special label with special origins in a period of political turmoil and cultural nationalism (e.g., 1960's when the term "Chicano" became more popular within this group), and is thus charged with a sense of ethnic pride and separatism from many, if not most, things American (including the term "Mexican American"). In its origins, it is a rejection of past social labels of this U.S. "minority" group. It is a rejection of the American crucible of so-called "melting pot" assimilation. It is also a reaction against various kinds of historical oppression and exploitation of this group since the military conquest in the middle of the 19th Century with the Mexican American War of 1848. Thus the term "Chicano" itself carries this political identity or "disidentification" element as in the present case.

The origins of Chicano scholarship do seem to have their basis in some form of political commitment. Such is inherent, for example, in the works of George I. Sanchez and Ernesto Galarza, two of the earliest "Chicano" scholars. Sanchez' work was con-

cerned primarily with Mexican Americans and education in the U.S. His work focussed on documenting, calling attention to, and correcting the inequities forced upon Chicano children in the early to mid-1900's through language and mental ability testing, segregation, and "tracking." Galarza's multitomed work focussed principally on unionization efforts of workers and analysis of the exploitation of Mexican agricultural workers in the United States, particularly by U.S. "agri-business" corporate interests. In their works, fundamental critique and a sense of scholarly "passion" is most evident. They critiqued established institutions and institutional and political patterns in the exploitation of Mexicans in the U.S. They wrote their articles and books with a special zeal perhaps because the nature of the social problems they saw called for it, as they pretty much stood alone in their social critiques in the 1930's through the 1950's. Yet, their political commitment and the political relevance in their work did not detract from their scholarship.

It can be argued as I do here, that in a real sense, their perception of the gravity and urgency of the social situation concerning the "Chicano" community about which they wrote, and their political commitment, enhanced their scholarship. It was not the other way around. They seemed to know implicitly that if their arguments and critiques were to serve any purpose, they would have to be thoroughly informed by and stand the "acid test" of prevalent standards of intellectual scrutiny and scholarly discourse. Both aggressively pursued "the facts," and their works are chock full of bibliographic entries, citations, and data tables attesting to their meticulous attention to detail, precision, and substantiation in their statements.

Political Commitment, Partisanship and "Objective" Scholarship

The greatest surge in the numbers of minority academics began to take place during the socially turbulent 60's. It was a period characterized by intense pressure for "social relevancy" and political "commit-ment" particularly on the part of leaders, intellectuals, and other elites. Racial/ethnic scholars often found themselves unable, if not unwilling, to play the role of detached social analysts. On one hand, they often could not, even if they wanted to. On the other, as members of these groups, many had themselves experienced the slings of social inequity and were more predisposed toward activism and social change.

The larger social and political context of minority social movements of the 1960's, for example, tended to influence or coerce its young, emerging intellectuals/scholars into often-nationalistic postures in defense of their communities, in both their social actions and in their written works. They were almost forced by historical and structural circumstances to become *engagè*, to play a more direct advocacy role versus the more typical detached scholarly role normally given to intellectuals and scholars. This is not meant to imply that **all** the emerging minority intellectuals felt these pressures and adopted a committed and engaged mode. For many, this larger political, group context coupled with the often unrealistic and unfair expectations of them by the university, created conflicting demands and expectations which might be characterized by "role balance," "marginality" (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937; Hughes, 1945) and "status inconsistency" problems (Lenski, 1954; Goodenough, n.d.), wherein they often found themselves playing the role of Simmel's "stranger" (1950, originally 1908) in academe.

Direct commitment, advocacy, and action were seen as - and probably were - necessary. At that time, these "scholars" did not have the time or facility to engage in the traditional culture of civility, leisure, and luxury of "objective, scholarly research, and analyses." This does not mean that the pressures and the impulses to commit themselves to detached scholarship and become apolitical, uninvolved intellectuals were not there also (along the lines, for example, of Robert Park's admonishments to some of his African American students at the University of Chicago - to forget about their community and political activism and concentrate on their studies).

In this way, minority scholars were (are) placed in a role conflict dilemma between being a "strict scholar," a "scholar-advocate," an "advocate-scholar" or a "strict advocate." This dilemma, I suspect, continues to haunt many of them today.

The expectations and pressures of the university have generally been at odds with those of these racial/ethnic communities. On the one hand, the university demands the cultivation of objective detachment; while on the other, minority communities need practical involvement in social action for political change. This larger social and political context and these kinds of attendant social pressures have moved many scholars from among these groups to seek

answers and skills that directly translate into meaningful resolution to the social injustice and inequality which their communities face. This process has prompted many minority scholars into racial/ethnic issues as areas of substantive research in their own academic careers.

Furthermore, it seems that it is precisely these research areas and perspectives they practice in academe which — aided by the divisions that arise as a consequence of academic concentration and segmentation — help keep them in the role of second class academic citizens. That type of research, particularly when it is combined with involvement in their respective communities, continues to be negatively evaluated within the halls of academe. These subjects and perspectives of social research not only challenge many established academic discourses, but also, because they are new to academe, tend to be viewed askance within academe. Thus, even within an institution that prides itself on seeking knowledge and being receptive to new ideas, there is resistance to these particular new ideas that these minority newcomers bring to academe.

In many respects, the discussion of Chicano scholarship is part of a larger debate concerning the role of scholarship in general: whether to critique and change society's "contradictions" (e.g., class-structured inequality, racism, sexism, etc.), or to merely study social reality for the sake of study and merely describe and analyze this reality, regardless of the fact that this social reality may itself be epiphenomenal of the development, interests, and contradictions of capitalist societies. The former proposes the wedding of a political fervor and commitment to scholarship (a "committed scholarship"), while the latter usually passes for a detached, "objective" scholarship. The former is usually accused of political advocacy and partisanship on behalf of "the working class," racial/ethnic minorities, and other social groups not positively affected by those capitalist contradictions. The latter is equally accused of merely "pretending" to practice a detached and objective scholarship (e.g., to "let the chips fall where they may" and "let 'the facts' speak for themselves" — as if they actually could — ultimately serving the interests of preserving the status quo and of those social groups in power in society. Where does this argument, however, ultimately leave "scholarship?"

If it is a problem of "detachment" or "objectivity" for a Chicano analyst to objectively study Chicanos, then is it not equally a problem for any social being as analyst to study "social facts?" Both are members of and participants in the phenomenon they study — society.

Thus, political commitment and membership in a particular "outsider" group (Becker, 1963), should not, in themselves, be preconditions for the existence, expectation, or imputation of bias and lack of analytical detachment. That this lack of "detachment" can be present on the part of these scholars there is no doubt. But the detachment or lack of it, the scientific rigor or lack of it, does not automatically emanate from the analyst's political commitment and/or racial/ethnic group affiliation. The fact that there was such "political" fervor and urgency, for example, in the works of Sanchez and Galarza did not really detract from their objectivity, for their works and the vigor with which they were written ultimately were both based on solid "objective" facts and on the reasoning and logic generally associated with these. Furthermore, to commit acts of emotional valuations and commitment under these circumstances is neither abnormal nor unreasonable. As Nathan Hare states in his article on "The Challenge of a Black Scholar":

> *The black scholar can no longer afford to ape the allegedly "value-free approach of white scholarship. He must reject absolutely the notion that it is not professional" ever to become emotional, that it is somehow improper to be "bitter" as a black man, that emotion and reason are mutually exclusive. (1973:73-74)*

Scientifically-flawed works are rather those works which, in themselves, (not their authors and their affiliations, values, and thoughts) are internally incorrect or inappropriate from a "scientific standpoint." Because their works may have presumably been written to benefit the oppressed, the exploited, the "underdog" (Gouldner, 1968), does not, in itself, mean that what they wrote was incorrect and invalid. It is probably because they saw or experienced these social injustices that they were drawn to research and write in those areas. This is legitimate enough. Researchers and writers write on subjects about which they hold particular interests and feelings. Malinowski did not write about Trobrianders because

he was not interested in the subject. The way we come to develop interest (or disinterest) in a subject can occur in a variety of ways and for different reasons. However, no matter how this comes about, there is no harm in being interested in what one studies. In fact, it is probably a precondition. Moreover, if some are **more interested** than others in a subject, there is still no harm. Far from it, this is a natural process that confirms the fact that an analyst, any analyst, is first and foremost a social being with values, likes and dislikes, outlooks, and specific roles and responsibilities within social groups.

I now want to touch on a related subject that is, I believe, inextricably tied to the foregoing discussion. This has to do with the scholarly validity or legitimacy of ethnic studies-type research or research on particular racial/ethnic groups. It is quite clear that in the social sciences (as in most sciences), the more general and broad the topic and the analysis, postulates, and conclusions generated, the more legitimate they are from a theory-building and scholarly point of view. Thus, social relations is perceived as more general, and therefore valid, than race relations, which is seen as more general (and valid) than Chicano research, etc. While this may, on the face of it, be true, it is also true that much of what passes for legitimate research is not really all that broad in either its descriptive or explanatory scope nor in its generalizability. Such is the case, for example, of country-, region-, period-, or group-based research (e.g., Japanese or Russian society in the 17th Century, Mexico or Peru, Hawaiians, school finance in Quebec, etc.). That these are limited in scope and applicability there is no question. Yet when certain more specific racial/ethnic group topics are counterposed to these, the former are generally the winners. Why? Why is the study, for example, of the Southwest or of the United States' 22 million (according to the 1990 census) so-called "Hispanic" origin inhabitants not "as broad" as these other areas? Are these not "legitimate" areas of scholarly inquiry? And if not, then what determines what is or is not a legitimate area for this type of inquiry?

There is also another issue that I believe is endemic in judgements of this type of racial/ethnic "outsider" group scholarship. This has to do with the relationship between **who they are** and the topics they study (usually research on the Chicano community or what is ordinarily termed "the Chicano experience"). There seems to be a (most often unstated) "sacred cow" in the social sciences, that a person who conducts research on his or her own group of origin or membership is not totally capable of attaining another sacred cow — "scientific detachment." The more general "law" in this regard seems to run something like this: Any "person who shares a particular personal, emotional affinity with, membership in, and commitment to a social group (e.g., racial/ethnic, gender, sexual preference, occupational, deviant, etc.) and who then attempts to write about this group, cannot expect nor be expected to be entirely scientific in that endeavor." A sort of complementary argument also exists which posits that any person of any social persuasion or origin who is well trained in "the scientific method" is capable of understanding any social reality to which he or she is an outsider and to which he or she has no particular commitment. Furthermore, the fact that this person is an outsider to the research topic at hand is probably, it is argued, an asset since this will more readily ensure the minimization of a *prior* emotional attachments and commitments, and will thus be in a better position to be "objective."

On the other hand, counterposed to this perspective is the common notion of *verstehen* (empathic understanding) which posits that in order to totally understand the full range of meaning and importance of a social reality to those who participate in it, it is necessary for the analyst to "assume the role of the other," become involved, and attempt to see that reality through "the participant's eyes." Field research such as participant observation, particularly in anthropology, is perhaps the best example of this.

These two different postulates seem to be at odds with each other. On the one hand, the argument goes, if one is a member or is otherwise actively involved with something as a routine part of one's life, we are too close to it and therefore our objectivity is suspect. On the other hand, one should become involved and participate in the life process of that reality in order to achieve "total understanding." But when one is "organically" tied to that reality, we may be too close to achieve this *verstehen*; or perhaps the perception is that one achieves it too well and too much (e.g., "being native" if from the inside, or "going native" if from the outside).

However, Reinhard Bendix (1970) suggests, as does Karl Popper (quoted in Bendix, 1970), that attachment or non-attachment to a particular group has little if anything to do with the attainment of scientific detachment. "Proximate objectivity," states Bendix, "results rather from an individual's participation in a scholarly community. Such a community is based on the inculcation of standards of discourse and investigation including the public disclosure of methods and results" (1970:64). It is rather the extent to which a person considers him/herself a member, an active participant in what Thomas Kuhn terms a "coherent tradition of scientific research" (1964:10), and espouses a commitment or "partisanship" to those values, that determines this "proximate objectivity." At bottom, the reasoning that those who are "close to" a subject cannot adequately treat this subject from a scientific perspective rests on rather weak premises. Certainly no one has, to my knowledge, ever "shown," much less "proven," (social scientists have a real fascination for "proving" things) this assertion in any way. In some respects, it can be argued that racial/ethnic minority scholars, because of their training in "outsider" institutions and their connectedness with "insider" communities, may tend to have the wiser perspective of such an outsider as well as the passionate concern of the native insider.

During the time of Max Weber (and today), scholars or university professors were assumed to be "scholarly" in their pursuit and espousal of knowledge (facts). It was not until a specific professor came to be known to consistently infuse his own political views and opinions (and propose these as facts) in his teaching or writing, that questions about that person's "scholarship" and scientific propriety surfaced. Such was the case, for example, with Heinrich von Treitscke and Friedrich Naumann, both German academics at the same university where Max Weber himself was teaching at the turn of the 20th Century. These two professors argued against scholarly detachment and in their own lectures openly espoused their own personal political opinions and emotionalist subjectivity (Bendix and Roth, 1971), prompting Weber to later write his discourses and lectures on the subject of "ethical neutrality" and "value-free science" (*Wert- freiheit*), upon his assumption of the editorship of the *Archiv fur Social - wissen-schaft und Socialpolitik*. However, doubts concerning the adequacy of these persons' scholarship arose only on a case-by-case basis and based on direct observation of these individuals' lectures and works. It was only after repeated observations of their behavior by different scholars that suspicion concerning the adequacy of their scholarship arose. Quite importantly, "they were not automatically suspect because of who they were (e.g., their particular ethnic/racial group, gender, language, skin color, surname, etc.)."

The issue of social "bias" in the social sciences is a thorny one indeed. Depending on the perspective and character of analysis, scientists can be accused of "bias" either from among their own ranks or from those outside these disciplines. The evidence of bias in some publication or piece of research ordinarily lies within the publication, e.g., lack of objectivity in the kinds of questions asked respondents, in the assumptions made, in the selection of data items and respondents, data inferences, etc. This characterizes, *mutatis mutandis*, the social sciences as practiced by largely Anglo analysts — of subjects generally long accepted as legitimate research areas.

However, especially in the case where non-Anglo analysts study non-traditional, non-mainstream research areas, the charge of bias and lack of valuative objectivity seem to be of a qualitatively (and perhaps quantitatively) different character. Whereas the imputation of bias earlier resulted from something **intrinsically** flawed in perspective and/or method, now the imputation is a *prior* and ultimately **extrinsically**-derived, and often with little bearing on the scholarly rigor of the research publication. In the case of certain less -- to non-traditional, non-Anglo, or non-male research subjects such as African American Studies, Chicano Studies, and (less so) Feminist or Women's Studies, the assumption of the violation of Weber's "ethical neutrality" (1949) law may often be assumed by Anglo social scientists and others, "regardless of the scholarly rigor in method and analysis of these latter works."

There seems to often be an automatic suspicion of racial/ethnic minority scholars writing in areas directly related to issues specific to their groups of origin. Although most often unstated, this charge seems to be that research by minorities is somehow less rigorous, academically inferior, and intended to serve political (agendas) or social causes; hence, this research is biased and non-objective. This charge seems to emanate from scientists not members of

these racial/ethnic groups and who hold no special interest in these kinds of research topics. Furthermore, those "dominant society" scientists may hold more general notions about what is legitimate scholarship. Their perception probably does **not** include these newer subjects ("and perspectives") of study. If articles by racial/ethnic minority, "outsider" scholars are read at all, it is often with this bias. (Interestingly, these are probably among the principal reasons for the lack of a serious penetration by Chicano scholars into mainstream, "insider," scholarly journals.)

Latino Professors' Views on Scholarship and University Life

In order to compare the views of Latino/Hispanic scholars and non-Hispanics on a number of issues, data from the 1984 Carnegie faculty survey (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1985) will be used to compare with those in the National Latino Faculty Survey I conducted in 1987. When that Latino survey questionnaire was designed, it was developed with this comparative purpose in mind. Therefore, a few identical or very similar questions from the Carnegie survey were included in the Latino survey. Much of what follows is based on these comparisons.

Scholarship

Perhaps it is appropriate to begin this section on faculty views with those views dealing with the basic hallmark of what most faculty do in universities: scholarly teaching and research. My interest here is to find out how these scholars see themselves and how they feel others see them in these categories.

Hispanic scholars believe in the role of the scienti-fic and scholarly enterprise at levels as high or higher than non-minority professors do. For example, Table 1 shows that 89.7% of Latinos and 78.5%

Table 1 Comparison of Academic and Political Views of U.S. Professors, by Total U.S. Faculty and Latino Faculty, 1984, 1987

Survey Question	*"Agree with reservations" to "Strongly Agree"* *Latino Faculty (1987)**	*All Faculty (1984)***
A. In my field, a person's research inevitably reflects his or her political values. (Carnegie version: In my subject, a person's teaching and research inevitably reflects his or her political values.)	65.6	27.9
B. Affirmative action is working effectively to bring more members of my own racial/ethnic group to this university. (Carnegie version: Affirmative Action has increased the number of minority group members on my institution's faculty.)	22.9	56.1
C. I consider myself an intellectual.	89.7	78.5
D. Despite the differences among institutions and racial/ethnic groups in higher education, members of the academic profession share a common set of professional values. (Carnegie version: Despite differences among institutions, academics share common professional values.)	63.4	66.4
As an academic, I feel I ...		
E. ...share in a tradition of scientific research.	83.4	--.-
F. ...share in a particular sense of belonging to a scientific community .	73.8	--.-
G. ...am committed to the rules and standards for scientific pursuits.	84.9	--.-
H. In my department, I feel accepted as a scholar on an equal basis.	76.3	--.-

*Garza, Hisauro, 1987 [National Latino Faculty Survey]. Unpublished raw data.
**1984 Carnegie National Faculty Survey, Carnegie Foundation for the Advance-ment of Teaching, New York, as cited in The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1985.

of professors overall consider themselves intellectuals. While no Carnegie survey data are available for comparative purposes on this question, 83.4% of Latinos feel they "share in a tradition of scientific research," and 84.9% are "committed to the rules and standards for scientific pursuits." However, although they believe very strongly in the academic enterprise, they do not believe that the academy believes in them. Three out of every four (76.3%) Latinos do not "feel accepted as scholars on an equal basis" by their departments. Also, positive Latino responses are somewhat higher to the two questions which ask about "**shar[ing]** in a tradition of scientific research" (83.4%) and whether they are "**committed** to the rules and standards for scientific pursuits" (84.9%), than to "**sharing** in a particular sense of **belonging** to a scientific community" (73.8%). This difference suggests that, while they are committed to these academic/scientific ideals and have appropriated these for themselves in their own academic careers, they do not feel they **belong** to that community which upholds and promotes these ideals.

Latinos also tend to believe, at a much higher rate, that personal values play a central role in one's research. Thus, more often than not, in their minds there is no contradiction between these values and academic enterprise. It is probably for these reasons that many consider themselves "scholar-advocates."

Despite the fact that these scholars are often seen as being interested in "minority service" (Suinn and Witt, ca. 1982) and minority — or Latino-related advocacy by non-Hispanic and non-minority faculty, they actually subscribe to broader, traditional academic and scientific values, "often at higher rates," than do non-minority faculty (for example, see items C, E-G in Table 1). However, what is surprising and salutary in all of this is that they subscribe to these traditional academic beliefs despite the fact that many of them are concentrated in minority and/or Latino-related departments and subareas (e.g., Spanish language and literature, Chicano Studies, Comparative Cultures, Politics and Sociology of the Chicano Community, etc.) — areas, which one would think, would produce in-group-biased values and outlooks. The fact that the prime motivation for hiring Latinos seems to often be affirmative action requirements (Rochín and de la Torre, 1986), it seems reasonable to conclude that Latino faculty are seen primarily as affirmative action cases and only secondarily (if at all) as equals, as scholars in their own right.

Another, and perhaps even more important, area on which they significantly differ is in the belief in the relationship between personal political values and scholarship. Although the survey questions were slightly differently worded (item A in Table 1), there is comparability between the Latino and the overall faculty data. Sixty-five percent (65.6%) of Latinos and only 27.9% of faculty overall believe that "a person's research inevitably reflects his or her political values." Yet, despite believing that personal political values are implicit in a person's research, Latinos subscribe in as high or higher numbers to traditional notions about scholarship and intellectualism. In their minds, there is no contradiction between the two. This may be another important reason many would consider themselves "scholar-advocates."

However, two out of five (43.5%) Chicano and Puerto Rican professors (combined) feel that research **by** members of their own racial/ethnic group is seen as academically inferior and illegitimate within their departments (Table 2). This perception is stronger in the higher prestige universities (50.0%) compared to those with lesser prestige (29.3%). Relatedly, two out of every five (39.5%) of Chicanos/Puerto Ricans feel that research **on** their own racial/ethnic group is also seen this way outside their universities, in the larger world of scholarship. However, faculty in high prestige schools are significantly more likely to feel this way (47.8% compared to 26.4%). In a related question, a full 85.6% of Chicanos/Puerto Ricans felt that research on their own group is either rated as being of **low** quality (45.2%), or of **high(er)** (40.4%) quality when Anglos do this kind of research. This means that the rest, or only 14.4% actually think this kind of research is either **highly** (5.8%) rated no matter who does it, or **high(er)** when done by Latinos (8.9%). This suggests that the negative evaluation of this kind of research is perceived by Chicanos/Puerto Ricans as reflective of bias against both the topic of research as well as the minority person doing this kind of research. I suspect that a similar negative evaluation may also take place regarding other minorities engaged in racial/ethnic-based research.

Research

As stated above, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and probably equally African Americans, and Native Americans are involved in ethnic group-based research in quite large numbers. For example, two out of three Chicanos/Puerto Ricans teaching in edu-

Table 2 Perceptions of Chicano and Puerto Rican Faculty on How Latino Group-Based Research is Rated in Academe, by University Prestige, 1987*

Question	*All Universities* N	#**	%	*High Prestige Universities* N	#**	%	*Low Prestige Universities* N	#**	%
A.Research by members of my own racia/ethnic group is seen as academically inferior and illegitimate within my department.	124	54	43.5	68	34	50.0	58	17	29.3
B.Research on the topic of my own racial/ethnic group is seen as academically inferior andillegitimate within my department.	124	49	39.5	69	33	47.8	57	15	26.3
C.In your opinion, how do you think research on your own ethnic/Hispanic group is generally rated by those in decision making positions in most academic departments of U.S. universities?	104			56			49		
Low no matter what person or group does it		47	45.2		31	55.4		18	36.7
High(er) when Anglos or non-Hispanics do it		42	40.4		19	33.9		22	44.9
High(er) when members of my own ethnic or Latino/Hispanic group do it		9	8.7		5	8.9		4	8.2
High no matter what person or group does it		6	5.8		1	1.8		5	10.2
Total		104	100.0		56	100.0		49	100.0

Source: Garza, Hisauro, [National Latino Faculty Survey]. Unpublished raw data 1987.
*For a description of prestige, see endnote number 4 in this paper.
**Answering "Agree with reservations" to "Strongly agree."
Percentages may not total 100.0 percent due to rounding.

Table 3 How Often Teach Classes on Subject of Own Ethnic Group and/or Latino/Hispanics, for Chicanos and Puerto Ricans Combined, 1987 (All Sampled Disciplines)

How Often	*Teaching by Chicanos/Puerto Ricans*
Never to Rarely	36 (28.8)
Sometimes to Always	89 (71.2)
Total	n=125 (100.0)

Source: Garza, Hisauro, [National Latino Faculty Survey]. Unpublished raw data, 1987.

Table 4 Percent of Total Weekly Research Time Devoted by Hispanic Professors to Subject of Own Ethnic and/or other Latino/Hispanic Group(s)

	Research By		
Percent Time	*All Latino/Hispanic*	*Chicano/ Puerto Rican*	*Other Latino/ Hispanic Groups*
0 (None)	23 (15.0)	19 (19.6)	4 (7.2)
1-40%	57 (37.3)	31 (31.9)	26 (46.4)
41-100%	73 (47.7)	47 (48.5)	26 (46.4)
Total	n = 153 (100.0)	n = 97 (100.0)	n = 56 (100.0)

Source: Garza, Hisauro [National Latino Faculty Survey]. Unpublished raw data, 1987

cation, humanities, social sciences and ethnic studies wrote dissertations dealing with their own group, Latin America, minorities or very closely related topics. More importantly, seven out of every 10 of this same group teach courses dealing with their own racial/ethnic group and/or other Latino/Hispanic matters (Table 3). Of those conducting research, 85% are involved in research concerning their own racial/ethnic Hispanic group; and of these, half (48.5%) spend from 41 to 100% of their weekly research time on this same subject (Table 4).

Conclusion

I have tried to show that academe is not the ideologically homogeneous nor scholarly and harmonious, monolithic milieu it is often assumed to be. Indeed, the disparities among these scholars' numbers and social positions on U.S. campuses, based on racial/ethnic group membership, may be so pronounced as to provide what may well be one of the central, if not **the** central, factors for the division among academics and for the "channeling" and "segmenting" of certain racial/ethnic academics within universities. I tried to underscore the paucity and limitations of existing research in the area of Chicano faculty in higher education, and to suggest that this may in itself be related to the distribution of decision making power in academe along racial/ethnic lines.

What limited data and studies exist, tend to suggest that these social cleavages in academe exist. For example, there tends to be a concentration of Chicanos in Chicano Studies departments and/or in "related" programs and departments such as Spanish and languages, as the work of Rochín and de la Torre (1986) seems to suggest. All this would suggest that there is a continuing need for original and in-depth research that addresses the status of Chicano academics and their research topics and perspectives. Similarly, there is an outstanding need to reassess those "sacred cows" themselves in academe regarding the very nature of what constitutes "rigorous" and "legitimate" scholarship, and their relationship to institutional barriers that may help maintain these racial/ethnic social divisions. It seems fairly clear that the opportunities that began to take place in the progressive social legislation of the 1960's, although often aided by research emanating from universities, may have had only a limited counterpart in the world of the academy and scholarship itself. Hence, it seems that as the social analysts surveyed, measured and analyzed the inequalities in the rest of society, their "own backyard" was largely ignored. They did not similarly study themselves.

Among other things, for example, it is clear that this Chicano professoriate often plays key roles in attracting, retaining and graduating so-called "Hispanic" students. They help create a culturally diverse, relevant, receptive and supportive university setting. Besides contributing generally through their roles as researchers and teachers to the advancement of learning and culture, they also directly contribute to the personal development of the young minds and leaders of each generation. In large measure, these scholars are the social analysts who, as Karl Mannheim notes, are involved in "work[ing] up the material of their common experiences" (1952:304), or as Bennett

Berger similarly notes, "those intellectuals engaged in the creation and discussion of culture i.e., [in] the formulation of the 'spirit of the age' [*zeitgeist*]" (1960:22). The presence of these scholars and Chicano/Latino Studies programs on campus, make the experience and expectations of undergraduate and graduate students that much more meaningful, in general, and credible in particular. As Chicano scholars who may have them-selves struggled to attain their own education and career, they are in a particularly strategic position to provide the necessary and meaningful role models, mentoring and motivation necessary for many "Hispanic" students to stay and succeed in college.

The need for scholars and researchers from within this national group is extremely important. Whether within the structure of formally established Chicano/Latino Studies programs or departments, or in traditional academic departments, these scholars play important roles as researchers, lecturers, advisors and spokespersons oftentimes on issues concerning the Chicano group and "Hispanics." It is these individuals who often focus attention on important social issues concerning the "Hispanic" group itself, whether in educational or economic opportunity issues, immigration, community studies, voting patterns, exploration of the intersection of class, race and gender issues in social inequality, etc. These are all issues which become increasingly pressing as "Hispanics" (and especially Chicanos) continue to grow dramatically in population size and in importance nationally (Bouvier, 1984; Bouvier and Martin, 1985).

Thus, there continues to be an outstanding need to provide critical analysis and policy-related data that will make important contributions to social scholarship and political decision-making in a number of areas generally centered on the intersection of Chicanos, the university and scholarship. Without these kinds of basic research, it is doubtful that interest in Chicano/Latino Studies or Chicano/Latino-related research on the Chicano/ Latino people will be encouraged and maintained by the larger society in general, and academe in particular. To further aggravate matters, the financial cutbacks in the public sector mean that universities have become far from aggressive in their efforts to adequately recruit, support and train Chicanos and other "minorities." With minor exceptions, at present, there are some indications that this dominant society and its universities do not seem to learn, understand, support or take an active interest in the development of Chicano/Latino scholars and their scholarship. Nor do they seem to be receptive to the pressing social, historical and contemporary demographic needs of the community from which these scholars emerge. (The lack of adequate data and analyses are in part to blame for this state of affairs.)

Thus, the federal and state governments in general, and colleges and universities in particular, will need to reassess their commitments to developing, attracting, promoting and retaining talented thinkers from within this group. New research needs to be conducted which will aid society and the university regarding an important sector within the Chicano/Latino community. At a time when colleges and universities have to seriously reassess their efforts to increase "minority" faculty, this research will not only need to provide much needed data, but make specific, practical, policy recommenda-tions to these institutions.

Furthermore, those who currently have the power to define what is scholarship and what is not, the gatekeepers of the world of scholarship, will likewise need to do some serious soul searching about the new topics and perspectives that have surfaced in the last two decades. Relatedly, innovations will need to be made here and there, that will allow for both these different perspectives, as well as share decision-making power with these new actors on the academic scene. Short of serious and concerted efforts in these areas, with the appropriate commitment of necessary resources, it is doubtful the secondary social status of Chicano and other "minority" scholars will attenuate anytime soon, nor will their scholarship achieve the recognition it deserves. Left unchecked, these problems will likely continue to divide the academy along these racial/ethnic lines.

Endnotes

1. The currently fashionable umbrella term "Hispanic" also seems to express opposite political values. "Hispanic" is also burdened with a number of historical, demographic, and sociological problems, the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this paper. This is why the term "Hispanic" is used with quotation marks (" ") here.

2. See, for example, the following by George I. Sanchez: "A Study of the Scores of Spanish-Speaking Children on Repeated Tests," M.A. thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1931; "The Implications of a Basal Vocabulary to the Measurement of the Abilities of Bilingual Children," *Journal of Social Psychology,* vol.5, 1934; "Bilingualism and Mental Measures: A Word of Caution," *Journal of Applied Psychology,* vol.8, December, 1934; *Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans,* Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1940; Concerning Segregation of Spanish-Speaking Children in the Public Schools, *Inter-American Occasional Papers, No.9,* Austin, Texas, 1951.

   For Galarza, see the following: "Life in the United States for Mexican People: Out of the Experience of a Mexican," National Conference of Social Work proceedings, vol.56, University of Chicago Press, 1929; "Introduction," to R.C. Jones' *Mexicans in the United States: A Bibliography,* Division of Labor and Social Information, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., 1942; *Strangers in Our Fields,* U.S.-Mexico Trade Union Committee, Washington, D.C., 1956; *Merchants of Labor: The Mexican Bracero Story,* McNally and Loftin, Santa Barbara, Calif., 1964; *Spiders in the House,* University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Ind., 1970; *Farm Workers and Agri-Business in California, 1947-1960,* University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Ind., 1977.

3. It can be argued that the perception of and eventual imputation of bias to these "outsiders'" research largely by Anglo "insiders," is itself a fundamental element in shaping the character and kinds of subjects and perspectives adopted by these newcomer analysts — historical and economic exploitation and social (including academic) exclusion.

4. The college and university classification system developed by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976) is used in the assignment of colleges and universities in this paper to either high or low prestige categories as follows:

   High Prestige = Research Universities I and II; Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II; and
   Low Prestige = Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II; Liberal Arts Colleges I and II.

References

Alvarez, Rodolfo and Kenneth G. Lutterman and Associates. 1979. *Discrimination in Organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance.* New York: The Free Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1970. *Embattled Reason: Essays on Social Knowledge.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bendix, Reinhard and Guenther Roth. 1971. *Scholarship and Partisanship: Essays on Max Weber.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berger, Bennett. 1960. "How Long is a Generation?," *British Journal of Sociology, vol. 11,* (March).

Bouvier, Leon F. 1984. "Planet Earth 1984-2034: A Demographic Vision," *Population Bulletin, Vol.39, No. 1* (February).

Bouvier, Leon F. and Philip Martin. 1985. *Population Change and California's Future.* Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc.

Braddock, Jomills H. and James M. McPartland. 1986. *How Minorities Continue to be Excluded from Equal Employment Opportunities: Research on Labor Market and Institutional Barriers.* Center for Social Organization of Schools. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Burstein, Paul. 1985. *Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics: The Struggle for Equal Employment in the United States, 1940-1980.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chronicle of Higher Education. 1985. "New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers," Dec. 18.

Goodenough, W. H. n.d. "Rethinking 'Status' and 'Role,'" in Michael Banton (ed.) *The Relevance of Models in Social Anthropology.* London: Tavistock.

Gouldner, Alvin. 1968. "The Sociologist as Partisan: Sociology and the Welfare State," *The American Sociologist,* vol.3, no.2 (May).

Hare, Nathan. 1973. "The Challenge of a Black Scholar," in Joyce Ladner (ed.) *The Death of White Sociology.* New York: Random House.

Hughes, Everett C. 1945. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status," *American Journal of Sociology,* vol. *50* (March).

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1964. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lenski, Gerhard E. 1954. "Status Crystallization: A Non-vertical Dimension of Social Status," *American Sociological Review,* vol. 19 (August).

Mannheim, Karl. 1952. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers, Samuel L., Jr. 1977 "Personal Testimony: The Agony of the Black Scholar in the White World," *Phi Delta Kappan,* vol.58, no.10 (June).

Park, Robert E. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology,* vol. 33, no. 6 (May).

Piliawsky, Monte. 1982. *Exit 13: Oppression and Racism in Academia.* Boston: Southend Press.

Rafky, David M. 1972. "The Black Scholar in the Academic Marketplace," *Teachers College Record,* vol.74, no.2 (December).

Rochín, Refugio I. and Adela de la Torre. 1986. "Chicano Studies and Affirmative Action in Higher Education: Complementarities and Prevailing Issues." Chicano Studies Program. University of California at Davis.

Simmel, George. 1950. "The Stranger," (originally, 1908) pp. 402-408 in Kurt Wolff (ed.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Stonequist, Everett V. 1937. *The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict.* San Francisco, Calif.: Charles Scribner 's Sons.

Suinn, Richard M. and Joseph C. Witt n.d. "Survey on Ethnic Minority Faculty Recruitment and Retention," mimeo, ca. 1982, Colorado State University.

Weber, Max. 1949. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences.* New York: Free Press.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. 1980. Minority Employment in Western Higher Education: Faculty, Administrators, Professional Staff. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Wingfield, Harold L. 1982. "Affirmative Action: The Shootout over Racism and Sexism at the University of Oregon, 1973-1975" unpublished dissertation. Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon.